REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 7, 9-12, 16, and 18-20 are now pending in this application for which applicants seek reconsideration.

Amendment

Claims 4-6, 8, 13-15, and 17 have been canceled, claims 1-3, 9-12, 16, 18, and 19 have been amended, and new claim 20 has been added. Independent claims 1, 10, and 19 have been amended to more clearly define the present invention. The preamble of claim 19 further has been amended to embody the computer program in a computer-readable medium to overcome the § 101 rejection. No new matter has been introduced.

Art Rejection

Claims 1-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ino (JP 11-298517) in view of Nobuhiko Sato (JP 09-200419) (hereafter Sato). Applicants submit that the present amendment obviates this rejection because none of the applied references would have disclosed or taught setting the present time based on both the sent time and the received time, as set forth in independent claims 1, 10, and 19.

Independent claims 1, 10, and 19 call for creating an e-mail addressed to the information processing apparatus, with the time of the transmission contained in the body of the e-mail. In addition to the sent time, the server also includes in e-mail the time at which it receives the e-mail. These claims call for setting the present time based on both the sent time and the received time, both of which are contained in the e-mail received by the receiving unit. Unlike Ino and Sato, according to the claimed invention, the sent time is to be placed in the body before the e-mail is received by the e-mail server.

Ino discloses using an e-mail server to synchronize a local (client) clock by sending a self-addressed e-mail. When the e-mail server receives the e-mail, it adds the time at which it received the e-mail into its header. The client apparatus extracts the receipt time placed by the e-mail server, and sets the extracted time as the current time. Ino also discloses correcting the present time with an offset value S*T, where S indicates retry number of retrying e-mail reception when the client apparatus fails to receive an e-mail, and T indicates the retry interval.

Sato discloses correcting a printer time by sending an inquiry to a host computer, and setting the printer time based on the time obtained from the host computer.

Both Ino and Sato fail to disclose or teach setting the present time based on the time the

e-mail was sent, which sent time is placed in the body of the email. Rather, Ino and Sato merely would have disclosed setting the present time based on the receipt time stamp placed by the e-mail server and the time designated by the host computer. If there is a delay in receiving e-mail from the e-mail server, Ino's client apparatus cannot accurately set the present time. This is because Ino's client apparatus sets the present time based only on the reception time of the e-mail set by the e-mail server. Indeed, there is a time lag because the e-mails are generally transferred via a plurality of SMTP servers on the Internet. If the time lag is large, Ino's client apparatus cannot set the present time with accuracy.

Accordingly, even if the combination were deemed proper for argument's sake, the combination would not have disclosed or taught the invention set forth in independent claims 1, 10, and 19.

Conclusion

Applicants submit that the pending claims patentably distinguish over the applied references and are in condition for allowance. Should the examiner have any issues concerning this reply or any other outstanding issues remaining in this application, applicants urge the examiner to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSSI, KIMMS & MCDOWELL LLP

03 JANUARY 2008
DATE

/Lyle Kimms 010308/
LYLE KIMMS
REG. NO. 34,079 (RULE 34, WHERE APPLICABLE)

P.O. BOX 826
ASHBURN, VA 20146-0826
703-726-6020 (PHONE)
703-726-6024 (FAX)